

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2/9/2018 9:24 AM
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

NO. 94892-5

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Petitioner,

v.

WENDY GRANATH,

Respondent.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES

Christine A. Jackson, WSBA No. 17192
Attorney for Respondent

The Defender Association Division
King County Department of Public Defense
810 Third Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 477-8700, ext. 78819
Christine.jackson@kingcounty.gov

Issue: Does the plain language of RCW 10.99.050 authorize a post-conviction-no-contact-order issued as a condition of a suspended sentence to survive completion of the sentence?

State v. Granath, 200 Wn.App. 26, 39 note 3 (2017).

Court initiated post-conviction Sexual Assault Protection Orders
RCW 7.90.150(6)(a)(does not exclude victims of domestic violence)
RCW 7.90.150(6)(c) (such orders shall remain in effect for a period of two years following the expiration of any sentence of imprisonment and subsequent period of community supervision, conditional release, probation or parole.)

Court initiated post-conviction Stalking Protection Orders
RCW 7.92.160(c) (A final stalking no-contact order entered in conjunction with a criminal prosecution shall remain in effect for a period of five years from the date of entry.)

State v. Roggenkamp, 153 Wash.2d 614, 625, and note 6, 106 P.3d 196 (2005) ("Where the legislature uses certain statutory language in one statute and different language in another, a difference in legislative intent is evidenced."). *See also* In re Forfeiture of One 1970 Chevrolet Chevelle, 166 Wn.2d 834, 842, 215 P.3d 166, 170 (2009) (We assume the legislature means exactly what it says and interpret the wording of statutes according to those terms. Where the legislature uses different terms we deem the legislature to have intended different meanings.)

State v. Veliz, 176 Wn.2d 849, 862, 298 P.3d 75, 81 (2013) ("If the legislature had intended the residential provisions in domestic violence protection orders to have the force of parenting plans for the purposes of the custodial interference statute, it would have said so by referring to such orders as parenting plans.")

Respectfully submitted this 9th day of February, 2018.

/s/Christine A. Jackson
Christine A. Jackson, WSBA#17192
Attorney for Respondent

February 09, 2018 - 9:24 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 94892-5
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington v. Wendy Granath
Superior Court Case Number: 15-1-03405-3

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 948925_State_of_Add_Authorities_20180209092257SC421627_2755.pdf
This File Contains:
Statement of Additional Authorities
The Original File Name was Additional Authorities.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- ann.summers@kingcounty.gov
- chris.fyall@kingcounty.gov
- magda@defensenet.org
- paoappellateunitmail@kingcounty.gov
- stephanie.guthrie@kingcounty.gov

Comments:

Sender Name: Christine Jackson - Email: christine.jackson@kingcounty.gov
Address:
810 3RD AVE FL 8
SEATTLE, WA, 98104-1655
Phone: 206-477-8700 - Extension 78819

Note: The Filing Id is 20180209092257SC421627